

Application No. 10/761,449

Page 6

**Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated November 29, 2005 and is due on or before February 28, 2006.

Currently Claims 1, 12, 16, and 18-26 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended Claim 16 to correct the issue mentioned in paragraph 2 of the office action. Claim 25 was rejected, such rejection being moot in view of the amendment to Claim 25.

Claims 1, 16 and 18 were rejected as anticipated by Ohrvall et al (Ohrvall) US patent application 2003/0230876. Ohrvall does not show the generally interdigitating placement of the first and second restrictions according to amended Claim 1 (and newly added Claim 26).

Claim 16 was also rejected as anticipated by Heigl USP 6,273,456. Heigl does not show or teach the invention in Claim 16 as amended. Further, Claim 16 was rejected as anticipated by Bakhsh et al, USP 6,899,350. Bakhsh et al does not show or teach the invention in Claim 16 as amended.


Claims 19-25 were rejected as anticipated by Heudorfer et al (Heudorfer) USP 6,394,487. Heudorfer does not show restrictions extending from a top edge portion of the air bag.

Claim 12 was rejected as obvious in view of the Ohrvall in view of Heigl. Neither of these cited references shows the novel placement of the second set of restrictions set forth in Claim 12 as now amended.

Claim 25 was rejected as obvious over Hardig USP 6,454,298 in view of Sonnenberg et al (Sonnenberg) USP 6,695,347. Neither of these cited references shows the novel placement of the second tether set for in Claim 25 as now amended.

In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully urged that the present application be reconsidered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Markell Seitzman  
Reg. No. 28,756

(586) 726-3905  
(586) 726-4172 (fax)